Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-33 are pending and stand rejected.

Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview was conducted among Applicant's Representatives, Lawrence E. Ashery and Eric Berkowitz, and Examiner Lau and his Supervisory Examiner on March 8, 2010. The Examiners are thanked for their efforts. During the Interview, Applicant's Representatives argued the patentability of claims 1 and 32. The Examiners agreed that claims 1 and 32, without amendment, overcome the current rejections.

Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-23 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 4, claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-17, 19-23 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0176095, hereafter referred to as Yamada) in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0063402, hereafter referred to as Takeda).

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to an address information setting method, and recites:

... presenting the selected home agent to the user;

receiving, from the user, an input which indicates a judgment by the user whether to switch to the selected home agent or not;

generating a home address from the prefix distributed by the selected home agent when receiving the judgment by the user to switch to the selected home agent ...

That is, a home agent is selected, the selected home agent is presented to the user and then a judgment by the user is received. The judgment indicates whether or not to switch to the selected home agent. Moreover, when receiving the judgment by the user to switch to the selected home agent, a home agent address is generated from the prefix distributed by the selected home agent.

Yamada Reference

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner acknowledges that Yamada does not expressly disclose the user input feature of "presenting the selected home agent to the user; [and] receiving, from the user, an input which indicates a judgment by the user whether to switch to the selected home agent or not," (brackets added; as recited in claim 1). Applicant agrees with the Examiner's acknowledgement and further submits that Yamada does not disclose or suggest this user input feature recited in claim 1.

Takeda Reference

In the Office Action, at page 3, the Examiner contends that Takeda discloses the user input feature recited in claim 1. The Examiner cites paragraphs [0138], [0139] and [0215] of Takeda for support of his contention. Takeda, however, at paragraphs [0138] and [0139] discloses that the mobile node MN 3 checks whether the home agent HA lists the source address of the Home Agent Address Discovery Reply message. If the HA list includes a source address (of HA 11), the MN 3 registers its current location with an HA in the HA list. The address at the top of the HA list (HA 12A) is used by the MN 3 for binding. MN 3 of Takeda sends a Binding Update Message to register its location to the HA 12A. Takeda further discloses at paragraph [0215] a general statement that the Takeda invention includes hardware and software that interact with a human user. Although Takeda discloses such a general statement, it is clear from paragraph [0165] of Takeda that the server 21 orders the HA list by preference value and, thus, the selection in Takeda of a home agent by server 21 occurs <u>without a judgment by the user</u>. That is, Takeda teaches selection of the home agent based on the position of the home agent in the home agent list ordered by server 21 and, in particular, Takeda is silent regarding the user input feature recited in claim 1 (e.g., selection of a home agent based on the user input).

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Takeda for at least the above set forth reasons.

Claim 9

Claim 9, which includes similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Takeda for at least similar reasons to those regarding claim 1.

Appln. No.: 10/553,542
Amendment Dated March 16, 2010
Reply to Office Action of January 20, 2010

MAT-8765US

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-23 and 33

Claims 2-8, 11-14, 16-17, 19-23 and 33, which include all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 9, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Takeda for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Claim 32

Claim 32 is directed to an address information setting method, and recites:

> ... indicating in the list of routers whether each home agent from among the routers has capability to accommodate a mobile router; and

> establishing a connection of the mobile router to another home agent that does not have the capability to accommodate the mobile router when the mobile router changes operation from those of a mobile router function to those of a mobile terminal function,

That is, a list indicates whether each home agent has capability to accommodate a mobile router. Moreover, a connection of the mobile router to another home agent that does not have the capability to accommodate the mobile router is established (when the mobile router changes operation from those of a mobile router function to those of a mobile terminal function).

Yamada Reference

In the Office Action, at page 9, the Examiner contends that Yamada discloses the list feature recited in claim 32 (i.e., "indicating in the list of routers whether each home agent from among the routers has capability to accommodate a mobile router") and that paragraphs [0042] read on this list feature. The cited paragraph, however, disclose that a home agent list 411 is a list of home agents each capable of providing a home agent function to a mobile node using a home agent flag. In Yamada, the mobile node selects a home agent based on the address and priority in the home agent list. (See Yamada at paragraph [0053].) That is, Yamada is silent regarding the list feature recited in claim 32 and, more particularly, that the home agent list of Yamada indicates whether each home agent **is capable of accommodating a mobile router**. This is because, Yamada teaches that a home agent which cannot accommodate **home agent functions** is removed from the list and, thus, cannot be chosen by a mobile node in a switching operation. Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Yamada does not expressly disclose "establishing a connection of the mobile router to another

home agent that does not have the capability to accommodate the mobile router when the mobile router changes operation from those of a mobile router function to those of a mobile terminal function," as recited in claim 32. This is because, Yamada discloses a switch to another home agent based on a position on the home agent list 411. By contrast, claim 32 discloses the establishment of a connection to home agent when the another mobile router switches functions (i.e., from a mobile router function to a mobile terminal function).

Takeda Reference

In the Office Action at page 9, the Examiner contends that Takeda discloses "establishing a connection of the mobile router to another home agent that does not have the capability to accommodate the mobile router when the mobile router changes operations from those of a mobile router function to those of a mobile terminal function (p.5, [0107], 0108])." The portions cited by the Examiner, however, disclose that based on certain criteria (e.g., the number of BC entries, the number of transmitted packets and the number of received packets exceeding a threshold) the preference value for a particular home agent HA may be decreased. Takeda further discloses that the highest preference value home agent may be used for binding updates. Takeda, however, is silent regarding the establishment of a connection to another home agent based on the condition (that the another home agent does not have the capability to accommodate the mobile router when the mobile router changes operation from those of a mobile function to those of a mobile terminal function). Instead, Takeda teaches a load balancing technique based on preference values.

Accordingly, claim 32 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Takeda for at least the above set forth reasons.

Rejection of Claims 10, 15, 18 and 24-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 5, claims 10, 15, 18 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Yamada in view of Takeda in further view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,277,416, hereafter referred to as Chang).

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10, 15, 18 and 24-31, which include all of the limitations of claim 9, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Takeda for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

The addition of Chang does not overcome the deficiencies of Yamada. This is because, Chang does not disclose or suggest:

> ... a display unit that presents the selected home agent to the user;
>
> a user judgment acquiring unit for receiving, from the user, an input which indicates a judgment by the user whether to switch to the selected home agent ...
>
> the information setting unit sets the address of the selected home agent and a home address which is generated from a prefix distributed by the selected home agent as information regarding the selected home agent when receiving the judgment by the user to switch to the selected home agent,

as recited in claim 9. This is because, Chang, which discloses a handset 5 that includes various keys making up a keypad 47, is silent regarding selection of a home agent or user judgment as to whether to switch to a selected home agent.

Accordingly, claims 10, 15, 18 and 24-31 are submitted to patentably distinguish over Yamada in view of Chang for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Conclusion

In view of the arguments set forth above, Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicant

EB/nm
Dated: March 16, 2010
P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700
NM613552